SUBJECT No. 144.

Special batta to the establishments of the Deputy Commissioners and the Heads of Departments during Dasara and Birthday festivities.

Mr. B. Venkataramaniah, Kolar Municipality.

Note.—Not taken up for discussion.

SUBJECT No. 145.

Increase of mileage to Sub-Assistant Surgeons.

Mr. Herur Gundappa, Kunigal Taluk.

Note.—Not taken up for discussion.

SUBJECT No. 146.

Claims to Savings Bank deposits and Life Insurance bonuses.

Mr. K. Ramanna, Hole-Narsipur Taluk.

Note.—Not taken up for discussion.

SUBJECT No. 147.

Nomination applications.

Mr. B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Anekal Taluk.

Note.—Not taken up for discussion.

SUBJECT No. 148.

Stamp vendors to be licensed to vend stamps up to the value of Rs. 100.

Messrs. B. Kesavaiya and T. B. Malle Gowda, Chikmagalur Taluk; and C. Channakesavaiya, Chitaldrug Taluk.

Note.—Not taken up for discussion.

SUBJECT No. 149.

Duty and penalty on promissory notes.

Mr. Thimmappaiya, Manjarabad Taluk.

Note.—Not taken up for discussion.

EXCISE.

(Nos. 150—158.)

SUBJECT No. 150.

Claims of inamdars to Excise Revenue.

Messrs. (1) S. Suryanarayana Setti, P. Suryanarayana Setti, Arkalgud Taluk; (2) Karnik Krishna Murthi Rao, Magadi Taluk; (3) T. M. Siddappa, Mysore Taluk; A. Ramanna, Bar Association, Mysore; and (4) K. Venkatasamaiya, Nanjangud Taluk; T. Srinivasachar, T.-Narsipur Taluk; and A. Ramanna, Bar Association, Mysore.

Summary of discussion.—(1) Excise Revenue of inám villages may be paid to the inamdars.

(2) Questions relating to the claims of inamdars to toddy revenue may be referred to a Committee. Both the shop-rental and the tree-tax may be given to them.

(3) The rules published in the Gazette of the 9th March 1916 are prejudicial to inamdars' interest. Government may be pleased to reconsider the whole question and pass early orders.

(4) The draft rules may be published in Kannada, an enquiry held and each inamdar examined with reference

to his grievances and possible remedies. Inamdars may be permitted to lease their shops.

Mr. V. Raghava Char represented that the right of inamdars to toddy revenue was given as a gift by the late Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar, that in the gift deed the increases in such revenue were also conceded, that this right was recognised during the Inam Settlement and later by special orders of Government in each case after enquiry, that this right could not be regarded as created by the order of 1901 or as in any way affected by the State taking over the management of excise administration in inam villages. He said that it was not therefore fair to limit the amounts that could be given to inamdars—among whom several mutts and important Ursu families are included—to certain portions of the tree-tax and shop rent as proposed in the draft rules published by Government and that the inamdars were according to the deed of gift of the Maharaja entitled to the actual amounts realized in their villages (minus the cost of collection). If the draft rules were passed, inamdars would lose excise revenue altogether. Shop rent would gradually dwindle with the increase of tree-tax, and the amount of tree-tax given to inamdars would be much smaller than the amount actually realised under the operations of the maximum limit, and further the inamdar would also suffer if a licensee did not tap the trees within the inam village for some reason or other. He also said that the new rules should not have retrospective effect and that it would be desirable to have the matter discussed by a Committee.

Messrs. Krishna Sastri, H. V. Rangaswami and some others were of opinion that it was against the interest of the tax-payer to recognise such claims of inamdars, that this would interfere with the progress of temperance, as inamdars would claim compensation for the closure of their shops, that if the inamdars were given toddy revenue, hiduvalidars would also demand it, that the tree-tax was a new item not existing when the inams were given, that in any case the inamdars should not be allowed to participate in the increase of excise revenue for which they are not in any way responsible, but which is due entirely to the growth of population and efficient management by the State, and that the question might be referred to a Committee. They also promised to submit a written representation in a month.

Messrs. B. K. Garuda Char and Karnik Krishna Murti Rao however argued that it was only a few inamdars—perhaps about 5 per cent of the whole—who were specifically granted excise revenue in their sannads and who were actually enjoying such revenue by themselves leasing

their groves and shops, that claimed the right, that it would be against justice and the express wishes of the donor to repudiate the claims now, that Government need not therefore fear that others could claim similar rights involving heavy expenditure to Government, that the inamdars claimed what accrued in their villages whether it be little or much and that they would not object to progress of temperance movement with possible fall of revenue in their villages.

Mr. B. K. Garuda Char said that the only proposal in the draft rule to which they objected was the one limiting the maximum amount which inamdars could get and that they had no objection to the others.

Mr. Amble Anniah Pandit said that the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar granted actual realisations which should be allowed. But, as the system of excise administration was changing, Government might give what was considered equitable, keeping in view the right of inamdars to actuals. It was not fair for Government to lay claim to a share in the tree-tax or shop rent when more was got, but to throw the loss on the inamdars when less was realised.

Mr. B. Narasinga Rao said that this was an important question affecting Government revenues and might be referred to a Committee and discussed again in the next session.

Mr. M. Venkatakrishnayya wanted it to be referred to a Committee consisting of two representative inamdars, two representative raiyats, the Inam Commissioner and the Excise Commissioner.

Reply of Government.—The draft rules have been considered by the public and the members of the Assembly, they are in general agreement regarding the main principle involved, *viz.*, the payment of tree-tax to the proprietor of the village in which the trees stand, all the facts necessary for the disposal of the question are before Government and orders will be passed in due course.

SUBJECT No. 151.

Disposal of lands included in date reserve and lands containing date and toddy trees.

Messrs. S. Narasimhaiya, Chiknayakanahalli Taluk; Kere Krishnappa, Gudibanda Sub-Taluk; Gori Rajanna, Babi Reddi and Chinnappa Reddi, Goribidnur Taluk.

Note.—Not taken up for discussion.